

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5, 6, 8, 12, 14-16, and 18 are amended. No new subject matter is added, and the amendments are fully supported by the original application. Claims 1-10 and 12-19 remain pending. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is requested in light of the following remarks.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,110,563 to Penimaa et al. ("Penimaa"). The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The Office Action alleges that claim 1 is anticipated by Pienimaa's FIGS 3-4. Upon careful analysis, however, it is apparent that the reference fails to disclose at least "a conductive coating in contact with the grounding point". Referring to FIG. 3 of the reference, the "conductive coating" (film 38) referenced in the Office Action is shown separated from the underlying structure by a polycarbonate film 37, which is clearly disclosed (at col. 4. lines 28-29) as an insulating layer. Turning to Pienimaa's FIG. 4, the "projection" 46 is shown on the opposite side of the circuit board from the electrical components, pointing in the opposing direction. The reference therefore does not disclose the structure articulated in our claim 1, which includes a conductive coating applied over a non-conductive coating that encloses an electrical component, with the conductive coating in contact with a grounding point disposed on the upper surface of the printed circuit board.

For at least this reason, Penimaa fails to anticipate claim 1 because it does not show the identical invention in as complete detail as contained in the claim. MPEP 2131. Reconsideration is therefore requested.

Claims 5-10, 12, and 16-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. 5981043 to Murakami et al. ("Murakami"). The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 5 recites an electrical component mounted on the surface of the printed circuit board, the electrical component electrically connected to a circuit trace by a

conductive element. Murakami's jumper circuit 7 allegedly corresponds to the recited electrical component. Murakami's jumper circuit 7 is for interconnecting the signal lands 3, 3' (column 9, lines 44-46). As shown in FIG. 1, the jumper circuit 7 is directly connected to the signal lands 3, 3'. Thus, Murakami fails to show that the jumper circuit is electrically connected to the signal lands by a conductive element as is recited in claim 5. For at least this reason, Murakami fails to anticipate claim 5.

Claim 5 further recites that the non-conductive coating conforms to a profile of the electrical component and has a substantially uniform thickness. Contrary to this feature, Murakami FIG. 1 illustrates that the insulating undercoat layer 8 does not conform to a profile of the jumper circuit 7, nor does it have a substantially uniform thickness. For this additional reason, Murakami fails to anticipate claim 5. Claims 6-10 and 12 are not anticipated by Murakami at least because claim 5 is not anticipated by Murakami.

Claim 16 recites electrical components disposed within the central region of the circuit board. This feature may be contrasted to claim 5, where that claim recites an electrical component mounted on the surface of the printed circuit board. In both cases, however, the final Office Action alleges that this feature is disclosed by Murakami's single jumper circuit 7 (FIG. 1; column 9, lines 43-46). Even to the extent that Murakami's jumper circuit 7 might arguably be equated to an electrical component as recited in claim 5, the jumper circuit 7 is in no way equivalent to the multiple electrical components as recited in claim 16.

Claim 16 further recites that the non-conductive coating has a substantially uniform thickness. Contrary to this feature, Murakami FIG. 1 illustrates that the insulating undercoat layer 8 does not have a substantially uniform thickness.

Claim 16 further recites that the conductive coating conforms to a profile of the electrical components. Contrary to this feature, Murakami FIG. 1 illustrates that the conductive layer 9 does not conform to a profile of the jumper circuit 7.

For at least any one of the reasons presented above, Murakami fails to anticipate claim 16 because it does not show the identical invention in as complete detail as contained in the claim. Claims 17-19 are not anticipated by Murakami for at least the same reasons claim 16 is not anticipated by Murakami.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-5 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pienimaa in view of Murakami. The applicant respectfully traverses these rejections. Claims 2-5 and 13-15 are allowable at least because any claim that depends on a nonobvious independent claim is also nonobvious. MPEP 2143.03.

Conclusion

For the above reasons, reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims is requested. Please telephone the undersigned attorney at the phone number listed below if it appears that an interview would be helpful in advancing this case.

If for some reason Applicant has not paid a sufficient fee for this response, please consider this as authorization to charge Ingrassia, Fisher & Lorenz, Deposit Account No. 50-2091 for any fee which may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

INGRASSIA FISHER & LORENZ

Dated: 11 May 2007

By: /TODD J. IVERSON, REG. NO. 53057/

Todd J. Iverson
(480) 385-5060